arXiv:1510.08022v1 [math.HO] 17 Oct 2015

About the uncountability of the number of irrational powers of irrational numbers evaluated as rationals and solutions' estimation for $x^x = y$ and $x^{x^x} = y$

Anca Andrei
Department of Mathematics
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX, U.S.A.
anca.andrei@utexas.edu

October 28, 2015

Abstract

It is well known that numbers are often used to define numbers. For example, two integers are used to define a rational number and two real numbers are used to define a complex number. It might be expected that an irrational power of an irrational number would be an irrational number. Despite this expectation, it is possible for an irrational power of an irrational number to be a rational number. For many generations, this circulated as a non-constructive proof by contradiction in logic for discrete mathematics textbooks and college courses [5]. Since the '80s, a constructive proof circulated orally, such as $(\sqrt{2})^{log_{\sqrt{2}}3}$ equals to 3. A written proof was published in 2008 by Lord [3].

The first contribution of this paper is to show that there is an uncountable number of such pairs of irrational numbers such that the power of one to the other is a rational number.

Marshall and Tan answered the question of whether there is a single irrational number a such that a^a is rational [4]. They proved that given $I = ((\frac{1}{e})^{\frac{1}{e}}, \infty)$, then every rational number in I is either of the form a^a for an irrational a or is in the very thin set $\{1, 4, 27, 256, ..., n^n, ... \}$. It seems a challenging task to analytically solve the equation $x^x = y$ for any real y. To the best of our knowledge, there is no work on finding x from a given y. We proved that $ln(ln(y)) < x$ for $y > e$ and $x < ln(y)$, for $y > e^e$.

Hence, the second contribution of this paper is to estimate the real x such that either one of the equations $x^x = y$ or $x^{x^x} = y$ holds, for a given y.

1 Introduction

This work establishes that there exists an uncountable number of irrational numbers a and b such that a^b is a rational number.

In 1900, David Hilbert posed a list of challenging problems, including a general problem referring to whether $2^{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ are transcendental numbers, among other interesting powers. A number is

algebraic if and only if it is the root of a polynomial equation with rational coefficients. On the contrary, a real number is *transcendental* if and only if the number is not algebraic. In 1934, Gelfond and Schneider proved, independently [1; 2; 6; 7], that if α and β are algebraic numbers with $\alpha \neq 0$, $\alpha \neq 1$, and $\beta \notin \mathbb{Q}$, then α^{β} is transcendental. Following Gelfond-Schneider Theorem, both numbers $2^{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ are transcendental.

In many discrete mathematics books, such as [5], a non-constructive proof for the existence of irrational powers of irrational numbers that are rational is provided. For example, the proof described in [5] does not indicate any such numbers, but only a non-constructive proof based on the fact that $\left((\sqrt{2})^{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\sqrt{2}} = 2$.

We continue these works by stating a few results about the irrational powers of irrational numbers which are evaluated as rationals. It is easy to prove that $\left((\sqrt{n})^{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{\sqrt{n}}$ is rational if and only if n is an even positive number, since $\left((\sqrt{n})^{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{\sqrt{n}} = n^{\frac{n}{2}}$. For example, $\left((\sqrt{4})^{\sqrt{4}}\right)^{\sqrt{4}} = 4^{\frac{4}{2}} = 16$, hence rational, while $\left((\sqrt{5})^{\sqrt{5}}\right)^{\sqrt{5}} = 25\sqrt{5}$, which is irrational.

In 2008, Nick Lord [3] published a constructive proof based on the fact that $(\sqrt{2})^{log_{\sqrt{2}}3} = 3$. Both $\sqrt{2}$ and $log_{\sqrt{2}}3$ are irrational numbers, but their power composition $(\sqrt{2})^{log_{\sqrt{2}}3}$ is a rational number. Lord generalizes this problem to more than just one number. He proved that if $\frac{m}{n}$ is any positive rational with $m \neq n$, and p is any prime which is neither a factor of m nor of n, then $\sqrt{p}$ and $log_{\sqrt{p}}\frac{m}{n}$ are both irrational. Furthermore, their power composition $(\sqrt{p})^{log_{\sqrt{p}}\frac{m}{n}}$ is the rational $\frac{m}{n}$.

An interesting question is how many irrationals α and β exist such that α^{β} is rational. Lord's result implies that there are (at least) a countable set of numbers α and β such that α^{β} is a rational. A *countable* set is a set with the the same cardinality as the set of natural numbers. A set that is not countable is called *uncountable*. Cantor proved that the rational set of numbers and the algebraic set of numbers are both countable sets. He also proved that the set of real numbers is uncountable.

Since the set of algebraic numbers is countable and the set of real numbers is uncountable, it follows that the set of transcendental numbers is uncountable.

Marshall and Tan answered the question of whether there is a single irrational number a such that a^a is rational [4]. They proved that given $I = ((\frac{1}{e})^{\frac{1}{e}}, \infty)$, then every rational number in I is either of the form a^a for an irrational a or is in the very thin set {1, 4, 27, 256, ..., n^n, ... }. It seems a daunting task to analytically solve the equation $x^x = y$ for any real y. To the best of our knowledge, there is no work on finding x from a given y. We proved that $ln(ln(y)) < x$ for $y > e$ and $x < ln(y)$, for $y > e^e$.

The paper's contribution is two-fold:

1. to show that there is an uncountable number of pairs of irrational numbers such that the power of one to the other is a rational number;

2. to estimate the real x such that either one of the equations $x^x = y$ or $x^{x^x} = y$ holds, for a given y.

2 The result about uncountability of irrationals power of irrational that are rational

Lemma 2.1 *If a is a positive transcendental number and c is a positive integer, then $log_a c$ is an irrational number.*

Proof By contradiction, we assume that $log_a c$ is a rational number. Hence, there exists a positive integer p and a non-zero integer q such that $log_a c = \frac{p}{q}$. This means $a^{\frac{p}{q}} = c$ which implies $a = (c)^{\frac{q}{p}}$. The number $(c)^{\frac{q}{p}}$ is algebraic because it is the root of the polynomial $X^p - c^q = 0$ with rational coefficients. On the other hand, a is a transcendental number, so the equality $a = (c)^{\frac{q}{p}}$ represents a contradiction. As a consequence, $log_a c$ is an irrational number and $a^{log_a c}$ is rational. ■

Lemma 2.2 *If a is a positive transcendental number, then there exists an irrational number b such that a^b is a rational number.*

Proof Let a be a positive transcendental number. Let $b = log_a c$, where c is a positive rational integer. Obviously, $log_a c$ is well defined because a and c are positive numbers. Since a is transcendental, $a \neq 1$ so the logarithmic function log_a is well defined.

By Lemma 2.1, $log_a c$ is an irrational number. Hence $a^b = a^{log_a c}$ is rational. ■

We are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.1 *There exists an uncountable set of irrational numbers a and b such that a^b is a rational number.*

Proof We choose a to be a positive transcendental number and $b = log_a c$, where c is an arbitrary positive rational number. According to Lemma 2.1, it follows that b is an irrational number. Based on Cantor's Theorem, the set of positive transcendental numbers is uncountable. Combining these aforementioned statements, this theorem is proved. ■

3 An estimation of the solutions of $x^x = y$ and $x^{x^x} = y$, for a given y

To obtain an estimation of the solution of $x^x = y$, we need an intermediate support lemma.

Lemma 3.1 *If z is a positive real, then $e^z > z + ln(z)$.*

Proof If $z \in (0, 1]$, then $e^z > 1 > z + ln(z)$ and the conclusion holds.

If $z \in (1, \infty)$, then we define f: $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $f(z) = e^z - z - ln(z)$. Obviously, f is a continuous and differentiable function on $(1, \infty)$, with $f'(z) = \dfrac{z \cdot e^z - z - 1}{z}$. Defining g: $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$g(z) = z \cdot e^z - z - 1$, we see that function g is continuous and has its first continuous derivatives. Its first derivative is $g'(z) = e^z + z \cdot e^z - 1$ and its second derivative is $g''(z) = (z+2) \cdot e^z$. Clearly, $g''(z) > 0$, for $z > 1$. Hence g' is a monotone increasing function, so $g'(z) > g'(1)$. Since $g'(1) = 2 \cdot e - 1$ is a positive real, g is also a monotone increasing function. Hence $g(z) > g(1)$. Since $g(1) = e - 2$ is a positive real, $g(z) > 0$. Thus $f'(z) > 0, \forall z > 1$. This implies that f is a monotone increasing function. Hence $f(z) > f(1) = e - 1$. Since this quantity is positive, the inequality of this lemma holds for $z > 1$, too. ■

Considering the equation $x^x = y$ for any real given y, Theorem 3.1 estimates the solution x.

Theorem 3.1 *Let us consider the equation $x^x = y$, for a given real y. Then, the following estimations of solution x hold:*

(a) if $y > e^e$, then $x < ln(y)$.

(b) if $y > e$, then $x > ln(ln(y))$.

Proof (a) Since $y = x^x$ and $y > e^e$, the inequality $x < ln(y)$ is equivalent to $x < ln(x^x)$, which is equivalent in turn to $x < x \cdot ln(x)$. Since $x^x = y > e^e$, it follows that $x > e$. Hence it follows that $ln(x) > 1$, so $x < x \cdot ln(x)$ holds.

(b) By substituting $y = x^{x^x}$, we get an equivalent inequality $x > ln(ln(x^x))$, where $x \cdot ln(x) > 1$. This inequality is equivalent to $x > ln(x \cdot ln(x))$, which is in turn equivalent to $x > ln(x) + ln(ln(x))$ for any real x such that $x \cdot ln(x) > 1$. Since $x \cdot ln(x) > 1$, it means that $x > 1$. Thus, there exists $z > 0$ such that $x = e^z$. The inequality to be proved becomes: $e^z > z + ln(z)$, Since this is the inequality from Lemma 3.1, we conclude the proof. ■

We are now ready to handle the exponentiated version of the previous equation, that is, $x^{x^x} = y$, for a given y.

Lemma 3.2 *If $x > e$, then the following statements hold:*

(a) $x < x \cdot ln(x) + ln(ln(x))$;

(b) $x > ln(x \cdot ln(x) + ln(ln(x)))$.

Proof (a) Since $x > e$, it means $ln(x) > 1$, so $ln(ln(x)) > 0$. Hence $x < x \cdot ln(x) + ln(ln(x))$;

(b) We prove a stronger inequality, that is, $x > ln(x+1) + ln(ln(x))$. Since $x > e$, it means $\exists z > 1$ such that $x = e^z$. We need to prove $e^z > ln(z \cdot (e^z + 1))$. We define f: $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $f(z) = e^z - ln(z \cdot (e^z + 1))$. Obviously, we observe that f is continuous and differentiable with first derivative $f'(z) = \frac{z \cdot (e^z)^2 - e^z - 1}{z \cdot (e^z + 1)}$. So, $f(z) > f(1) > 0$. Hence $x > ln(x+1) + ln(ln(x))$. The right hand side can be rewritten as:

$$ln(x+1) + ln(ln(x)) = ln((x+1) \cdot ln(x)) = ln(x \cdot ln(x) + ln(x)).$$

But $ln(x) < x$, so $ln(x) > ln(ln(x))$ by substituting x with $ln(x)$. Hence

$$ln(x \cdot ln(x) + ln(x)) > ln(x \cdot ln(x) + ln(ln(x))).$$

Therefore $x > ln(x \cdot ln(x) + ln(ln(x)))$. The lemma is proved. ■

Theorem 3.2 *Let us consider the equation $x^{x^x} = y$, for a given $y > e^{e^e}$. Then the following estimations of solution x hold:*

(a) $x < ln(ln(y))$;

(b) $x > ln(ln(ln(y)))$.

Proof Since $x^{x^x} = y$ and $y > e^{e^e}$, it means that $x > e$.

(a) The inequality $x < ln(ln(y))$ is equivalent to $x < ln(x^x \cdot ln(x))$ or $x < x \cdot ln(x) + ln(ln(x))$. By item (a) of Lemma 3.2, this inequality holds.

(b) Similarly, $x > ln(ln(ln(y)))$ is equivalent to $x > ln(x \cdot ln(x) + ln(ln(x)))$. According to item (b) of Lemma 3.2, this inequality holds. ■

Acknowledgments. We thank Dr. Ted W. Mahavier from Lamar University and to Dr. Ronny Hadani from University of Texas at Austin for their valuable comments while proofreading this work.

Conclusions

This paper proved that there exists an uncountable number of irrational numbers a and b such that a^b is a rational number. We also estimate the solutions x for both equations $x^x = y$ and $x^{x^x} = y$. Our results represent extensions of the works done by Lord in [3] and Marshall and Tan in [4].

References

[1] A.O. Gelfond. Sur la septieme Probleme de D. Hilbert. *Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci., URSS Moscou*, vol. 2, pp. 1-6, 1934.

[2] A.O. Gelfond. Sur la septieme Probleme de D. Hilbert, Bull. *Acad. Sci. URSS Lemingrade*, vol. 7, pp. 623-634, 1934.

[3] Nick Lord. Math Bites: irrational powers of irrational numbers can be rational. *Mathematical Gazette*, vol. 92, pp. 534-534, 2008.

[4] Ash Marshall, Yiren Tan. A rational number of the form a^a with a irrational. *Mathematical Gazette*, vol. 96, pp. 106-109, 2012.

[5] K.H. Rosen. *Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications.* McGraw-Hill, Seventh edition, 2011, ISBN: 978-0-07-338309-5

[6] T. Schneider. Transzendenzuntersuchungend periodischer Funktionen I. *J. reine angew. Math.*, vol. 172, pp. 65-69, 1934.

[7] T. Schneider. Transzendenzuntersuchungend periodischer Funktionen II *J. reine angew. Math.*, vol. 172, pp. 70-74, 1934.